### Nuke

#### Deterrence failure is likely --- incomplete intelligence and irrationality --- causes multiple conflicts

Cimbala 7 (Stephen, Distinguished Professor of Political Science – Penn State Brandywine, “Nuclear Proliferation and Deterrence in Asia: The View from Vladivostok”, Journal of Slavic Military Studies, 20, InformaWorld)

There is no “magic number” of nuclear-armed states that guarantees a first use of nuclear weapons in the twenty-first century. States will not become irrational on account of the possession of nuclear weapons: indeed, there is some experience during and after the Cold War to suggest that states might become more careful, rather than less. Many variables intrude here: including the intensity of regional rivalries; ethno-national and religious feelings; and, most immediately pertinent to our concerns, the pros and cons for deterrence and crisis stability of the forces themselves. Nevertheless, the propensity of heads of state for committing military follies should never be underestimated: especially by students of history and political science. The “rationalities” of states are not of the black box variety. States’ world views and decision making processes are the product of internal as much as external forces. A U.S. model of deterrence rationality may fail drastically in the imminent circumstances of a regional crisis. The strategic reach of Russian or American nuclear forces against lesser nuclear powers should not be overestimated. Iranians with scores to settle against Israel, Chinese intent upon annexation of Taiwan, or North Koreans seeking to intimidate Japan and South Korea, may not believe U.S. threats of preemption or retaliation. Russia’s policy of providing air defense missiles to Iran, increasing the difficulty of Israeli or American preemptive air strikes against Iran’s nuclear facilities, ironically invites the erosion of Russia’s own deterrence perimeter once the Iranians are nuclear capable. U.S. intelligence cannot be guaranteed to provide timely and accurate warning of nuclear attack by regional revisionist actors against neighbors: or others. U.S. intelligence has not infrequently been the victim of strategic or operational-tactical military surprise by non-Western opponents: from Pearl Harbor to 9–11. Timely and accurate intelligence is even less likely on the intentions or capabilities of non-state actors, compared to states. Intelligence on the best of days can give likelihoods and maybes for policy makers to mull over. One of the major risks of nuclear weapons spread in Asia is the possibility that states with first strike vulnerable nuclear forces will “use them or lose them” on the basis of faulty indications and warning.

### Preexisting

#### We meet – nuke power is preexisting and incentives increase in the squo we just make itmore appealing to investors

CI - Increase is to add to

Dictionary.com 6 (Dictionary.com: definitions, 11/3/2006, dictionary.reference.com, DA 6/21/11, OST)

**To make greater, as in number, size**, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.

We meet – we add to the amount of incentives in the squo

5. “Increase” doesn’t require prior existence

**Reinhardt 5** (U.S. Judge for the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT (Stephen, JASON RAY REYNOLDS; MATTHEW RAUSCH, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP, INC.; HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendants-Appellees., lexis)

Specifically, we must decide whether charging a higher price for initial insurance than the insured would otherwise have been charged because of information in a consumer credit report constitutes an "increase in any charge" within the meaning of FCRA. First, we examine the definitions of "increase" and "charge." Hartford Fire contends that, limited to their ordinary definitions, these words apply only when a consumer has previously been charged for insurance and that charge has thereafter been increased by the insurer. The phrase, "has previously been charged," as used by Hartford, refers not only to a rate that the consumer has previously paid for insurance but also to a rate that the consumer has previously been quoted, even if that rate was increased [\*\*23] before the consumer made any payment. Reynolds disagrees, asserting that, under [\*1091] the ordinary definition of the term, an increase in a charge also occurs whenever an insurer charges a higher rate than it would otherwise have charged because of any factor--such as adverse credit information, age, or driving record 8 --regardless of whether the customer was previously charged some other rate. According to Reynolds, he was charged an increased rate because of his credit rating when he was compelled to pay a rate higher than the premium rate because he failed to obtain a high insurance score. Thus, he argues, the definitions of "increase" and "charge" encompass the insurance companies' practice. Reynolds is correct. “Increase" means to make something greater. See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The action, process, or fact of becoming or making greater; augmentation, growth, enlargement, extension."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) (defining "increase" as "growth, enlargement, etc[.]"). "Charge" means the price demanded for goods or services. See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The price required or demanded for service rendered, or (less usually) for goods supplied."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) ("The cost or price of an article, service, etc."). Nothing in the definition of these words implies that the term "increase in any charge for" should be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.

6. It’s arbitrary – even if an aff is pre-existence they could say that the Aff doesn’t pre-exist enough so they can constantly shift the bar to not let us meet

Resonablity- our interpretation provides predictable limits and fair ground. Competeing interpretations is just a race to the most limiting definition – it’s in the literature especially for SMRs

### 2AC – K

#### Management solves extinction—letting nature “be” cements existing destruction – only nuke power can solve warming

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, **the idea that nature is** self-regulating and **capable of caring for itself**. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, **a century ago**, a hands-off policy **was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's** **current** fragmented and **stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating** spiral of **deterioration**. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even **fifty years ago**, neglect might have been the best medicine, but **that was a world** with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world **largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species**. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. **Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, management is the** only viable alternative **to massive attrition of living nature**.

#### Extinction outweighs

Bok 88

(Sissela, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Rosenthal and Shehadi, Ed.)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical Imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences. Acknowledging such a rift would post a strong challenge to the unity and simplicity of Kant’s moral theory.

#### US-lead development of nuclear power solves poverty – clean, affordable energy is key

**Robinson and Orient 4** - Professor of Chemistry and Founder of Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine AND \*\* executive director of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (Arthur and Jane, 6/14. The New American, “Science, Politics and Death.” <http://www.thenewamerican.com/node/358>)

Easily usable energy is the currency of human progress. Without it, stagnation, regression and untold human deaths will result. The lamentations of the popular press notwithstanding, there is no shortage of energy. Scientists define everything that man can perceive in the natural world as forms of "energy," including all physical objects. These forms of energy differ, however, in how easily mankind can make use of them by means of current technology. Nuclear power plants convert mass into electrical energy. This converted "nuclear energy" is, by far, the safest, cleanest and least expensive energy source available with current technology. Its use improves the standard of living, increases the quality and length of human life, and maximizes technological progress. The United States was once the world leader in the production of useful energy. Had that American leadership continued, our country and our world would be very different. Technological miracles that are only dreams today would have already taken place. Moreover, very large portions of the world's poor and underdeveloped people would have been able to lift themselves from poverty - provided they had a laboratory of liberty in which to do so - and to escape the horrible conditions in which they lead lives of desperation, constantly at the edge of death. Many people strongly desire to help humanity. They spend their lives in efforts to increase the quantity and quality of human life. Most other people, even though they do not work actively toward these goals, share the same values. They passively support things that improve human life. Those who understand energy production and its link to technological progress and who have positive humanitarian values support nuclear power. They are also in favor of hydrocarbon power derived from coal, oil and natural gas, and of hydroelectric power. Their interest in solar power, biofuel power, wind power and other alternatives is less because those methods cannot yet generate large quantities of inexpensive useful energy.

#### Ongoing poverty outweighs nuclear war and genocide—only our impact evidence is comparative

Spina 00 (Stephanie Urso, Ph.D. candidate in social/personality psychology at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, Smoke and Mirrors: The Hidden Context of Violence in Schools and Society, p. 201)

This sad fact is not limited to the United States. Globally, 18 million deaths a year are caused by structural violence, compared to 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. That is, **approximately every five years, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths**, and **every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period**. This is, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war or genocide**, perpetuated on the weak and the poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. (See James Gilligan, Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic, New York: Vintage Books, 1997, 196).

#### Plan solve meltdowns

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### Meltdowns cause extinction

Lendman 11 – Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (Stephe, 3/13. “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan” The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>)

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.

#### AND - Status quo facilities risk terrorist attacks

**Early et al 9** – assistant professor in the Political Science and Public Administration & Policy Departments at the University at Albany, State University of New York, Former Research Fellow at Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (Bryan, with Matthew Fuhrmann and Quan Li, 4/30. “Atoms for Terror: The Determinants of Nuclear/Radiological Terrorism.” Social Science Research Network. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1397210)

Second, nuclear facilities present targets of opportunity for terrorist groups. Attacking structures that produce or house radioactive materials, such as nuclear power plants, could cause large-scale radiological contamination or, at least, generate that fear in the public.23 Such attacks may appeal to groups that seek mass-casualties or publicity. Indeed, numerous groups have plotted to target nuclear plants. For example, al-Qaeda possessed ―diagrams of American nuclear power plants‖ and considered using commercial airliners to strike nuclear reactors as part of the 9/11 attacks.24 On a smaller scale, the North African terrorist group Salafia Jihadia plotted to launch a suicide attack against a French nuclear power plant in May 2003.25 The more extensive a state’s civilian nuclear infrastructure, the more potential targets terrorist groups can plan and execute attacks against.

#### SMR’s solve

Carelli, et al. 10 (M.D. (Westinghouse, Science & Technology Center), P. Garone (Politecnico di Milano, Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering), G. Locatelli (Politecnico di Milano, Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering), M. Mancini (Politecnico di Milano, Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering), C. Mycoff (Westinghouse, Science & Technology Center), P. Trucco (Politecnico di Milano, Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering), M.E. Ricotti (Politecnico di Milano, Department of Energy, CeSNEF-Nuclear Engineering Division) , “Economic features of integral, modular, small-to-medium size reactors”, Progress in Nuclear Energy, Vol. 52, 2010)

Even the technological choices on the design phase can directly affects the economics of NPPs. An integral and modular approach to the design of the nuclear reactors offers the unique possibility to exploit a simpliﬁcation of the plant. This can lead to a reduction of the type and number of components. As an example, the complete integration of all the primary components inside the Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) reached by IRIS design (Carelli et al., 2004) avoids large, high pressure piping. This positively affects also the safety of the plant, allowing a dramatic increase of the safety level, via a reduction of the number of safety systems and a simpliﬁcation of the remaining ones. The integration concept increases also the compactness of the plant (volume over power ratio), with a reduction of the containment volume. A further positive effect is that also the security of the NPP is improved, with a small imprinting of the plant on the ground and a limited area of its skyline, leading e.g. to a reduction of terrorist air attack probability. Moreover, the plant lifetime can be increased and the plant quality of performance kept all along its lifetime, since e.g. radiation damage on the RPV is practically avoided by the inherent shielding provided by the large water thickness between the RPV and the core. Considering all these aspects, for a given size, the multiple SMRs option might decrease the Levelized Unit Electricity Cost (LUEC).

#### Even a failed terrorist attack causes extinction

Sid-Ahmed 4, political analyst 04 (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

**What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the** new and frightening **world in which we are now living**. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, **tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate**. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is **if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious.** Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. **When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers**.

#### nuclear images enhance the value of life – the only way to love is to experience fear

**Fox 85** (Michael Allen, Professor of Philosophy – Queen’s University, Editor – Queen’s Quarterly, and Ph.D. – University of Toronto, Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives, Edited by M. Fox and L. Groarke, p. 127)

Nor can we rid ourselves of the conditions that cause the unique fear and anxiety of the nuclear age. It is unlikely that the bomb will go away, and even if it does, the knowledge of how to make it won't; nor will the Russians disappear. There remains but one choice: we must seek a reduction of world tensions, mutual trust, disarmament, and peace." Security is not the absence of fear and anxiety, but a degree of stress and uncertainty with which we can cope and remain mentally healthy. For security, understood in this way, to become a feature of our lives, we must admit our nuclear fear and anxiety and identify the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses. It is necessary to realize that we cannot entrust security to ourselves, but, strange as it seems and however difficult to accept, must entrust it to our adversary. Just as the safety and security of each of us, as individuals, depends upon the good will of every other, any one of whom could harm us at any moment, so the security of nations finally depends upon the good will of other nations, whether or not we willingly accept this fact. The disease for which we must find the cure also requires that we continually come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought and recoil from it. In this manner we can break its hold over us and free ourselves to begin new initiatives. As Robert Jay Lifton points out, **"**confronting massive death" helps us bring ourselves "more in touch with what we care most about in life. We [will then] find ourselves in no way on a death trip, but rather responding to a call for personal and professional actions and commitments on behalf of that wondrous and fragile entity we know as human life."37 I have tried to show what we are up against. The first step toward change is to know what constraints are acting on us and to isolate those within our control because they are of our own making. Awareness of these conditions is often the road to their transcendence.

### 2AC – CP

#### SMR’s are key to successful desalination – solves water wars

Solan et al 10 – Assistant Professor of Public Policy & Administration and Director of the Energy Policy Institute at Boise State University (David, June. “Economic and Employment Impacts of Small Modular Nuclear Reactors.” Energy Policy Institute, Center for Advanced Energy Studies. http://epi.boisestate.edu/media/3494/economic%20and%20employment%20impacts%20of%20smrs.pdf)

Besides electricity generation, additional applications may be well-suited for SMR systems in the future. While the applicability of nuclear energy to additional applications is not dependent on facility size, the actual use of large nuclear facilities does not occur due to economic considerations. Currently, only a few countries utilize nuclear energy for non-generation purposes, primarily desalination and district heating (IAEA, 2008). A brief overview of the application possibilities for SMRs is provided below. Desalination.&&The IAEA has identified desalination as possibly the leading non-electric civilian use for nuclear energy. Water scarcity is becoming an increasingly problematic global issue in both developed and developing countries. As noted in an IAEA (2007) report, Because of population growth, surface water resources are increasingly stressed in many parts of the world, developed and developing regions alike. Water stress is counter to sustainable development; it engenders disease; diverts natural flows, endangering flora and fauna of rivers, lakes wetlands, deltas and oceans; and it incites regional conflicts over water rights. In the developing world, more than one billion people currently lack access to safe drinking water; nearly two and a half billion lack access to adequate sanitation services. This would only get worse as populations grow. Water stress is severe in the developed world as well…In light of these trends, many opportunities in both developed and developing countries are foreseen for supply of potable water generated using nuclear process heat or off-peak electricity (p. 23).

#### Extinction

Weiner 90 (Jonathan, Pulitzer Prize winning author, “The Next One Hundred Years”, p. 270)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

### 2AC – Elections DA (Obama Good)

.

#### Romney will maintain relations Russia.

Business Insider, 9/1/**2012** (Romney Could Screw Up US Relations With Russia, p. <http://www.businessinsider.com/mitt-romneys-foreign-policy-chops-come-into-light-2012-9>)

At the same time, the potential impact of a Romney presidency should not be exaggerated. Mr Romney is not an ideological politician, and he will have solid reasons to maintain a working relationship with Russia. These include reliance on Russian transit corridors to support US forces in Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond, Russia's veto in the UN Security Council, and its potential to act as interlocutor between the US and rogue states. Finally, there is a significant element of uncertainty that stems from the lack of clarity about what Mr Romney, who has often changed his position, actually stands for. In particular, the extent of the influence on him of several competing Republican foreign policy schools (neo-conservativism, populist isolationism, realism, liberal internationalism) is unclear.

#### Romney will win --- he is leading in key swing state polls and is gaining in New Hampshire. The undecided voters will break for Romney.

**Chambers** **9/19**/2012 (Dean, Mitt Romney likely win in presidential election shown by three key polls, Examiner, p. <http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-win-presidential-election-shown-by-three-key-polls>)

Rasmussen Reports has released today, three key polls that show Mitt Romney's likely win in this year's presidential election over President Obama. The Rasmussen Reports Presidential Daily Tracking Poll released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Obama. Rasmussen's Daily Swing State Tracking Poll of 11 key swing states won by President Obama in 2008 shows Romney leading them by the exact same percentages. The latest Rasmussen poll of New Hampshire released today shows Romney leading there 48 percent to 45 percent. New Hampshire is a key swing state that could make a difference with its four electoral votes, and George W. Bush would have reached 270 electoral voters in 2000 without having won this state. New Hampshire had narrowly favored Obama in many polls over the last few months and while the analysis conduced here by this columnist has consistently predicted Mitt Romney will win the state (based in part on knowledge of local politics in the state having lived in New England for years), most projected have shaded New Hampshire blue and predicted it will go for Obama. This Rasmussen survey is key in that it likely shows movement in New Hampshire in the direction of Mitt Romney. In the instance of an incumbent president who enjoys just about 100 percent name recognition and is seeking reelection, most of the undecided voters are likely to swing to the challenger by election day. This is especially true when the challenger remains still less known to the public than the incumbent, as is true with former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. By election day, those other nine percent not favoring Romney or Obama in the Rasmussen Daily Tracking poll are likely include less than one percent voting for third party candidates and five or six percent of those nine will likely vote for Mitt Romney. That would indicate a popular vote win by Romney of about 53 percent to 46 percent, or the reverse of Obama's win in 2008. This would lead to an electoral college total of more than 300 electoral votes for Romney. The 11 swing states tracked by Rasmussen in it's swing state tracking poll show Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent, where some weeks ago the two candidates were tied at 45 percent in the Rasmussen tracking poll of these 11 key swing states. President Obama won these same states collectively by a 53 percent to 46 percent margin in 2008. Now he is seven percent behind that finish now in these states. Romney is likely to capture most of the undecided votes and could win these states collectively by at least a 52 percent to 47 percent margin. That would likely lead to Romney winning Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin while having a competitive chance in Michigan and Pennsylvania. If President Obama can only win Michigan and Pennsylvania among those 11 swing states, he can not be reelected to the presidency. As these polls stand today, the election of Mitt Romney as our next president looks likely.

#### Overwhelming public support for nuclear energy - multiple polls

WNA 12(WNA is the World Nuclear Association. “US Nuclear Power Policy” August, 2012. http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41\_US\_nuclear\_power\_policy.html)

**Public opinion regarding nuclear power has generally been fairly positive, and has grown more so as people have had to think about security of energy supplies. Different polls show** continuing increase **in public opinion favorable to nuclear power in the USA. More than three times as many strongly support nuclear energy than strongly oppose it**. Two-thirds of self-described environmentalists favor it. A May 2008 survey (N=2925) by Zogby International showed 67% of Americans favored building new nuclear power plants, with 46% registering strong support; 23% were opposed[10](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). Asked which kind of power plant they would prefer if it were sited in their community, 43% said nuclear, 26% gas, 8% coal. Men (60%) were more than twice as likely as women (28%) to be supportive of a nuclear power plant. A March 2010 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed that strong public support for nuclear energy was being sustained, with 74% in favor of it[11](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). In particular, **87% think nuclear will be important in meeting electricity needs in the years ahead, 87% support license renewal for nuclear plants, 84% believe utilities should prepare to build more nuclear plants,** 72% supported an active federal role in encouraging investment **in "energy technology that reduces greenhouse gases", 82% agree that US nuclear plants are safe and secure, 77% would support adding a new reactor at the nearest nuclear plant, and 70% say that USA should definitely build more plants in the future.** Only 10% of people said they strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy. In relation to recycling used nuclear fuel, 79% supported this (contra past US policy), and the figure rose to 85% if "a panel of independent experts" recommended it. Although 59% were confident that used reactor fuel could be stored safely at nuclear power plant sites, 81% expressed a strong desire for the federal government to move used nuclear fuel to centralized, secure storage facilities away from the plant sites until a permanent disposal facility is ready. Half of those surveyed considered themselves to be environmentalists. A February 2011 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed similar figures, and that 89% of Americans agree that all low-carbon energy sources – including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy – should be taken advantage of to generate electricity while limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Just 10% disagreed. Also some **84% of respondents said that they associate nuclear energy "a lot" or "a little" with reliable electricity;** 79% associate nuclear energy with affordable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with economic growth and job creation; and 77% associate nuclear energy and clean air. A more general March 2010 Gallup poll (N=1014) on energy showed 62% in favor of using nuclear power, including 28% strongly so, and 33% against, the most favorable figures since Gallup began polling the question in 1994. However, only 51% of Democrat voters were in favor[12](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). An early March 2011 Gallup poll just before the Fukushima accident showed 57% in favor and 38% against, and in March 2012 (N=1024) still 57% in favor with 40% against (men: 72%-27%, women 42%-51%). **Regarding plant safety, the polls showed consistent 56-58% positive views over 2009-12, but men-women split similar. A survey conducted in September 2011** by Bisconti Research Inc. with GfK Roper **showed that although support for nuclear power decreased following the Fukushima accident** and compared with a year earlier (a survey carried out in March 2010 by Bisconti Research found 74% of Americans favored nuclear power), **62%** of the 1000 **adults** surveyed in the latest poll **were supportive of utilizing nuclear power** while 35% expressed opposition. The survey found that **82% of Americans believed that lessons had been learned from** Fukushima and 67% of respondents considered US nuclear power plants safe (the same level as reported one month before the nuclear accident in Japan occurred). Also **85% of said that an extension of commercial operation should be granted to those plants that comply with federal safety standards**, and 59% believed more nuclear power plants should definitely be built in the future, while 75% contend that “Electric utilities should prepare now so that new nuclear power plants could be built if needed in the next decade.” Finally, further expansion of the site of the nearest already operating nuclear power plant is supported by 67% and opposed by 28%. By February 2012 support had increased slightly to 64% supported using nuclear power, while 33% opposed it. Some 81% of respondents believed that nuclear energy will be important in meeting the USA's future electricity needs (compared with 80% in September), and 82% thought the USA should "take advantage of all low-carbon energy sources, including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy." Significantly, 74% believed that nuclear power plants operating in the USA are safe, up from 67% in both 2011 surveys. However, a Harris survey in February 2012 (N=2056) showed that only 40% of US adults believed that the benefits of nuclear outweigh its risks, while 41% thought the reverse. A similar poll conducted in 2011 before the Fukushima accident occurred, indicated that 42% thought that the benefits outweighed the risks, while 37% believed the opposite. In a 2009 poll, 44% thought the benefits outweighed the benefits, while 34% thought they did not. The southern states had the highest percentage of people believing the benefits outweigh the risks (at 43%), compared with 33% in the East and 41% in the Midwest and West. Some 42% of Americans thought that the benefits of using coal outweighed the risks (up from 38% positive in 2011), while 40% said the risks outweighed the benefits.

#### Plan is a win – seen as a move towards energy independence

#### More than half the country support nuclear expansion – its key to job growth

Whitman 8-13 [Christine Todd Whitman CASEnergy Co-Chair, Former EPA Administrator and New Jersey Governor, “Nuclear Power Garners Bipartisan Support”, August 13th, 2012, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php>, Chetan]

The energy policy that I’ve seen garner consistent support from the left and the right over the years is also one with which I’m deeply familiar. This policy involves building a diverse portfolio of low-carbon energy sources, featuring a renewed investment in nuclear energy. And it’s not just policymakers from both sides of the aisle who support nuclear energy – it’s everyday energy consumers as well. According to a Gallup poll conducted in March of this year, nearly 60 percent of Americans support the use of nuclear energy to meet our nation’s electricity needs, and a majority support expanding America’s use of nuclear power. Next-generation nuclear energy projects are underway in Georgia, South Carolina and Tennessee, thanks in part to steady popular support, as well as support from President Obama, bipartisan congressional leaders and other policymakers at the federal and state levels. An additional 10 combined construction and operating licenses for 16 plants are under review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This support is founded in the fact that nuclear energy, safely managed, provides an efficient, reliable source of energy. In fact, nuclear power is the only baseload source of carbon-free electricity. It provides nearly two-thirds of the nation’s low-carbon electricity, and will continue to be an important source of energy well into the future given the advent of innovative large and small reactor designs. The use of nuclear energy prevents more than 613 million metric tons of carbon dioxide every year – as much CO2 as is emitted by every passenger car in America. Bipartisan support for nuclear energy also stems from the boost that it provides to local job markets and to local and state economies. As nuclear energy expands and as more than half of the industry workforce approaches retirement, the industry offers growing opportunities for well-paying careers. The industry already supports more than 100,000 jobs, and the combination of retirements and the construction of new facilities could create as many as 25,000 new jobs in the near term. What’s more, the construction of a nuclear facility spurs the creation of other local jobs in industries ranging from manufacturing to hospitality. The industry generates between $40 and $50 billion in revenue and electricity sales, or some $470 million in total economic output and $40 million in labor wages at each U.S. facility every year. That’s a powerful economic engine and a positive impact that leaders are embracing. As America refocuses on cleaner energy policies that help boost our economy, nuclear power is becoming a clear and critical part of a secure, sustainable energy portfolio. We need electricity and we want clean air; with nuclear energy we can have both. It’s a source of power that leaders on both sides of the aisle can support.

#### SMRs address the only public concern about nuke power

Worthington 11 [David Worthington – Contributing Editor to SmartPlanet, “Small nuclear reactors: America’s energy future?” December 18th, 2011, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/intelligent-energy/small-nuclear-reactors-americas-energy-future/11412>, Chetan]

Small Modular Reactor (SMR) concepts could help make future nuclear power plants in the United States safer and easier to construct while helping to recycle stockpiles of existing uranium fuel waste. The general idea behind SMRs is to cluster together many small reactors to match the output of obsolete coal or nuclear facilities. Steam output from many modules would power a common generator to produce electricity. Each module would be equipped with its own containment assembly that’s housed in a pre-fabricated unit. Think of it as a nuclear assembly line. A module would be small enough to be shipped to a new reactor build by rail or truck rather than assembly components inside of a containment dome onsite. All-in-one fabrication would streamline nuclear power plant construction by several years, said Steve Rus, executive director for nuclear technologies at Black & Veatch. SMRs would be housed in a steel and concrete embedment that resides below grade. B&V has had a sizeable nuclear business since World War II. Small modular reactor designs are also supported by the Obama administration, which sees nuclear power as a way to reduce carbon emissions. However, the public is understandably warier of nuclear power post Fukushima, and would need some reassurances of its safety. The SMR addresses the greatest perceived danger - nuclear meltdowns – a threat that has loomed since the dawn of the nuclear era. It doesn’t require active cooling systems to prevent a meltdown, and would theoretically shut down safely without any outside intervention. Traditional active cooling systems at large scale reactors utilize water pumps and back-up power systems to control residual or decay heat after a reaction is stopped. An external power source and/or coolant are eventually necessary within a matter of days. Recent third generation+ reactor designs incorporate passive cooling technologies with traditional active cooling techniques, but that approach only buys more time until there’s meltdown conditions. Several reactors at Tokyo Electric Power’s Fukushima plants melted down when diesel back-up systems failed and mainland power lines were destroyed in the wake of twin natural disasters. It was reliant on active cooling, and its engineers hadn’t envisioned a tsunami striking far inland. A module reactor’s passive cooling system could theoretically survive that scenario, and non-water cooling systems could further increase margins of safety. “The concept is these could go on almost indefinite periods in passive manner with no intervention relative to the cooling of core and decay/residual heat. Potentially, it could never require any additional intervention,” Rus said. The initial SMRs will continue to utilize water for cooling and uranium fuel, but sodium and lead bismuth alloys could foreseeably replace water in fourth generation models – provided they pass Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) review, Russ said. The NRC’s regulators are very familiar with light water reactors, but alternative fuel sources would require different cooling methods, Rus said. Thorium is arguably safer than uranium both in the risk of accidents and for nuclear nonproliferation. “The coolant form is different than water, therefore there’s natural benefits in the way it cools reactor,” Rus explained. A sodium coolant would be liquid under normal operating conditions, but solidify and encase the reactor upon a cold shutdown. Molten salt is also a potential future fuel source. Aside from the NRC’s institutional history, uranium’s other advantage is that there’s also an abundance of fuel in the form of nuclear waste that is being sequestered at nuclear facilities around the United States. Spent fuel rods could become a source of energy for newer generation reactors, Rus suggested. “More than 90 percent of the energy is still in that fuel. One thing that has to come to life is recycling. After reprocessing, waste is significantly less, and then there ultimately needs to be a way to address that waste.”

#### Plan not key --- the state of the economy will outweigh.

New York Times, 3/13/**2012** (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?_r=1>)

The final major economic turning point of President Obama’s first term seems to have arrived. The question is which way the economy will turn. Job growth has picked up nicely in the last few months, raising the prospect that the American economy is finally in the early stages of a recovery that will gather strength over time. But with gas prices rising, the government cutting workers and consumers still deep in debt, some forecasters predict that economic growth — and with it, job growth — will slow in coming months. Politically, the difference between the two situations is vast. In one, Mr. Obama will be able to campaign on a claim, as he has recently begun to do, that the country is back on track. In another, he will be left to explain that recoveries from financial crises take years, and to argue that Republicans want to return to the Bush-era policies that created the crisis — as he tried to argue, unsuccessfully, in the 2010 midterm election. His approval rating has slipped again in some polls recently, with higher gas prices possibly playing a role. As a result, the economic numbers over the next couple of months, including an unemployment report on April 6, will have bigger political implications than the typical batch of data. The Federal Reserve acknowledged the uncertainty in its scheduled statement on Tuesday, suggesting the economy had improved somewhat but still predicting only “moderate economic growth.” Economists say the economy’s near-term direction depends relatively little on Mr. Obama’s economic policies. The standoff over Iran’s nuclear program, the European debt crisis and other events will most likely affect the economy more. But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth.”

#### Energy is not a key election issues --- other issues outweigh.

**The Washington Post**, 6/27/**2012** (Energy ads flood TV in swing states, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V_story.html>)

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.” Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

#### Tax credits are uncontroversial and do not trigger perceptions of spending.

Rigby 9, 1/5/2009 (Elizabeth – Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston, Research Affiliate at the National Center for Children and Families at Columbia University, Tax Credits vs. Spending: Why Progressives Should Care How the Stimulus is Delivered, Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elizabeth-rigby/tax-credits-vs-spending-w_b_155389.html>)

Described as a move to placate wary Republicans who shudder at an ungodly price tag nearing $800 billion, Obama has indicated that nearly half of the package will take the form of tax credits to individuals and businesses. As a political strategy, this tax-cut-heavy proposal seems smart, as evidenced by Republican leader Mitch McConnell's assessment of the proposal as "the sort of thing we could have bipartisan agreement on." But, from a progressive perspective, does the use of tax credit represent a political compromise that will limit the potential for the stimulus to seed more substantial policy change? Or is this truly a policy design that everyone should embrace? To answer these questions, I identify the key differences between tax credit and direct spending policy designs. These differences illustrate what is gained and what is lost by taking a tax-focused approach, as well as the details that progressives should attend to in order to make full use of this political opportunity. Before highlighting differences, I should note that tax credits operate like spending programs in many ways. Most importantly, they must be paid for through higher taxes elsewhere or equivalent cuts in spending to make up for forgone tax revenue. For this reason, I prefer the term "tax expenditures," which better captures the (albeit indirect) spending resulting from policy. Of course we know that, despite their budgetary similarity to direct spending programs, tax expenditures remain more political popular, easier to enact, and more sustainable over time. This is the result of a set of key differences, described below. #1: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Costs As described by Christopher Howard in his book, The Hidden Welfare State, the forgone taxes from tax expenditures do not show up in the normal government budgeting and policy review process. As a result, tax expenditures can provide governmental benefits without increasing the measure of government spending and by (ironically) seeming to reduce the total size of government. Not surprisingly, this slight of hand is popular with policymakers from both political parties who enjoy distributing benefits with little attention to their costs, making them much easier to enact and protecting the benefits from later cuts. #2: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Beneficiaries Since tax expenditures are distributed through the tax system, citizens can claim a benefit without needing to apply for or enroll in a government program. As a result, these benefits typically come with little stigma of the sort attached to Food Stamp or unemployment insurance receipt. This feature explains the paradox of wealthy conservatives who express disdain for those accepting welfare while happily claiming their mortgage and employer health insurance tax deductions each year. And it also helps explain why calls to cut government largess rarely focus on eliminating benefits delivered through the tax system and focus instead on cuts to programs that can be more easily attacked as handouts for the undeserving. #3: Tax Expenditures Bypass the Appropriations Process Unlike spending programs which must be first authorized and then go through appropriations to receive actual funding, tax expenditures are created and funded by the same committee in each chamber of Congress. This cuts in half the number of veto points (times that an organized opposition can kill a proposed bill) and makes tax expenditures easier to pass. Further, the absence of an annual appropriations requirement produces a virtual entitlement program in which all eligible tax filers who claim the credit receive the benefit without the waiting lists or capped spending seen in most spending programs. And finally, by avoiding the appropriations stage, tax expenditure proposals pass through the Congressional process avoiding most of the earmarking that produces the "legislative pork" abhorred by most Americans. Since tax expenditures are typically legislated by formula rather than earmark, they remain "cleaner" with less waste. #4: Tax Expenditures are Automatic Policy Tools As defined by Lester Salamon in his tome, The Tools of Government, automatic policy tools use an existing administrative structure rather than requiring a new administrative agency or infrastructure. As a result, a new tax expenditure policy can more quickly reach their designated target -- in this case the American economy. In fact, Obama's advisors have expressed a desire to get the stimulus into Americans' pockets quickly and noted a potential strategy in which they will make the individual-level credit retroactive to the 2008 tax year and adjust withholding formulas so that our paychecks will start reflecting the decrease in payroll taxes right away. That quick turnout-around is not possible for a new spending program that requires a more complex implementation structure. #5: Tax Expenditures are Indirect Policy Tools Again as defined by Salamon, indirect policy tools are characterized by the separation between the entity authorizing and financing the tax expenditure (in this case the federal government) and the entity that will actually carry out the services the expenditures provide. As a result, government has little control over how, when, and where government funds are spent. This is seen as an advantage by those wary of government intervention and trusting of the market, but as a disadvantage by those wanting to target the stimulus package to particular ends (such as spending rather than saving or to food assistance versus more fungible aid). In the longer term, reliance on indirect policy tools can also decrease public support for governmental solutions to social problems. This effect is illustrated in Jacob Hacker's The Divided Welfare State, which illustrates how our nation's heavy reliance on private pension and health benefits creates incentives for private actors to block significant public expansions in these areas. He notes how indirect support in the form of tax expenditures (and subsidies) from the government to private businesses and actors can facilitate the organization and advocacy of these groups who stand in the way of later public service expansion. Implications for the Stimulus and Beyond Considering these features, it is likely that Obama's use of tax expenditures for nearly half of the stimulus package is likely to ease enactment of the program by making bipartisan agreement easier due to the hidden costs (#1), the potential for quick and efficient implementation due to the automatic nature of program (#4), the lack of government administration (#5), and the ability to enact a tax expenditure package without opening up the door to earmarks and pork that would raise the overall price tag (#3). In essence, this is as "small" as "big government" can be. As a result, the part of the stimulus delivered this way is likely to be less controversial and more efficiently administered. Yet, these key differences between tax expenditures and spending programs highlight two other factors of importance to those concerned about progressive policy priorities. First, the use of tax expenditures makes the distributional consequences of the policy (i.e. who gets what) all the more important since the hidden nature of the costs (#1) and beneficiaries (#2), as well as lack of annual appropriation requirements (#3) will likely allow for any benefits to be sustained over time unlike many welfare, health, and social service programs that are being cut as we speak. This creates a real possibility for policy benefiting low-income and middle-class Americans; but, the degree to which the opportunity is seized depends on the details of the tax expenditures package (rather than the use of tax expenditures themselves). And secondly, the pairing of tax expenditures with spending programs can overcome most progressive concerns of the tax expenditure approach -- as long as the spending is really done right! For example, although the indirect nature of a tax-focused approach (#5) will dilute the governmental investment throughout our (still) large economy, the other half of the stimulus package comprised of direct spending programs can focus on those areas of aid and investment that we do not want the market alone to determine. For example, investments in already established spending programs that provide unemployment insurance, food stamps, and health care to those in financial crisis can assure that basic needs are met in ways that the more indirect nature of the tax expenditures just can not. Similarly, since even successful tax expenditures are rarely perceived as governmental assistance, it is the spending programs in the stimulus that will determine public perceptions regarding the capability of government to address a crisis and put us back on the right track. The bureaucratic bungling of a billion dollar package could damn our hopes of large-scale reform for decades, while a careful and competent set of spending priorities enacted without waste and corruption could help rebuild support for public programs that will pay dividends later on. The use of tax expenditures to distribute nearly half of the aid, can actually make it easier for the federal government to spend enough money to stimulate our economy while also cutting in half the size of spending programs that must be carefully administered devoid of waste, fraud, and abuse that would limit later efforts to build on the initial investment.

#### Nuclear power is key to Florida

Harrington 9-16 [Jeff Harrington – Tampa Bay Times, “How to win votes here”, September 16th, 2012, <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>, Chetan]

Here are five economic issues particularly relevant to Florida that President Barack Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney should address if they want to successfully woo this crucial swing state. 1 The jobs quandary: Quantity versus quality The raw unemployment number dominates headlines, but the quality of jobs created could play an even bigger role in jump-starting the economy. A recent study by the National Employment Law Project found that low-wage occupations accounted for 21 percent of the jobs lost during the Great Recession and a commanding 58 percent of jobs gained during the feeble recovery. Mid-wage occupations totaled 60 percent of jobs lost during the downturn but only 22 percent of the growth since then. It's been the same story in Florida. In fact, with the number of higher-paying jobs in the state's construction industry more than halved during the recession, the hit on income here may be more acute. Lower-wage jobs mean less disposable income, which doesn't bode well in an economy where consumer spending is by far the biggest economic driver. Romney says that overhauling the country's tax, trade and energy policies will create conditions that allow the private sector and entrepreneurs to create jobs and grow the economy. He wants states to create "personal re-employment accounts" for the unemployed to help place individuals directly into companies that provide on-the-job training. Obama wants to spend more on infrastructure, hire more state and local workers, increase the payroll tax cut and add a new set of tax cuts for small businesses. \* \* \* 2 Charting an energy policy that works Will Obama push policies that let the Sunshine State morph into the Solar Energy State? Will Romney push to restart idled nuclear power construction or clear the way for more offshore drilling? Will either candidate allow ''fracking'' for natural gas to continue largely unabated, driving down prices and postponing the need to tap other energy sources? Florida's future depends on the answers in many ways. The next president's energy policy could have a huge impact on Florida's tourism industry, which is heavily dependent on affordable gas and jet fuel to attract visitors. It could affect Progress Energy Florida's plan to build a new nuclear power plant as well as whether it opts to spend millions to fix its broken Crystal River nuclear plant. If drilling is allowed off Florida's coastline, the state's economic and environmental fortunes could be profoundly affected. Both Obama and Romney have supported increased offshore drilling, but Romney endorses being more aggressive in drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and the Arctic as well as off the Atlantic coast.

#### Florida is key to the election.

Funaro 12 (Kaitlin – breaking news writer for the Global Post, Florida is a must-win for both Obama, Romney, Global Post, p. <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/politics/120826/florida-must-win-both-obama-romney>)

Once again, Florida is turning out to be a make or break state in the 2012 election season. Both President Obama and Republican Mitt Romney are focusing their campaigns on winning over the Sunshine State's diverse group of voters. As Republicans and the media flood into Tampa before the start of the Republican National Convention, which was delayed until Tuesday because of Tropical Storm Isaac, all eyes will be on how well the Romney campaign's message resonates with Florida voters. The country's biggest swing state has grown in size and importance since President Obama won its 27 electoral votes in 2008. The state's increased population bumped its electoral prize up to 29 votes this November, reports the Orlando Sentinel. That's more than one tenth of the total number needed to win the White House. "The Republican nominee has not won the White House without carrying Florida since Calvin Coolidge," Daniel Smith, a political scientist at the University of Florida, told the Orlando Sentinel. "So I would say Florida is pretty important for Republicans in November."

### 2AC – Nat Gas Tradeoff DA

#### 2. Nat Gas Reliance Low now- nothing can solve demand any time soon

**Whipple 12**

[Tom, retired government analyst, 3/28/12, <http://www.fcnp.com/commentary/national/11459-the-peak-oil-crisis-our-natural-gas-glut-.html>]

With global warming driving down the demand for natural gas as a home heating fuel and natural gas drillers producing record amounts, an **oversupply situation has developed** quickly. Stocks of natural gas are rising. As a result natural gas prices have fallen way below profitability and drillers are scrambling to **cut back production**. The natural gas surplus that is in our underground storage facilities may be full before fall, forcing producers to slow production until a market for the gas can be found. There are only so many things we can do with an excess of natural gas: you can export it; burn it in power plants; turn it into other products in petrochemical plants; increase its use in vehicles; and burn it to heat buildings. Given the pace at which temperatures are rising, less, not more, home consumption seems likely so only one of these uses can be accomplished quickly - burning it in electricity generating plants. As the price of natural gas becomes cheaper, power companies are already increasing its share of the fuels used for power generation and are closing older coal-fired plants. Wherever prices are favorable we will likely see more of this in the immediate future.

#### 3. Causes methane – bigger IL to warming

Howarth et al 11 (Robert W. Professor of Ecology & Environmental Biology – Cornell, Renee Santoro, Research Aide for Howarth – Cornell, Anthony Ingraffea, Professor of Engineering – Cornell, “Methane and the Greenhouse-Gas Footprint of Natural Gas from Shale Formations,” Climatic Change, 106(4), p.679-690, Springer Link, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e384226wr4160653/?MUD=MP>)

We evaluate the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas obtained by highvolume hydraulic fracturing from shale formations, focusing on methane emissions. Natural gas is composed largely of methane, and 3.6% to 7.9% of the methane from shale-gas production escapes to the atmosphere in venting and leaks over the lifetime of a well. These methane emissions are at least 30% more than and perhaps more than twice as great as those from conventional gas. The higher emissions from shale gas occur at the time wells are hydraulically fractured—as methane escapes from flow-back return fluids—and during drill out following the fracturing. Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, with a global warming potential that is far greater than that of carbon dioxide, particularly over the time horizon of the first few decades following emission. Methane contributes substantially to the greenhouse gas footprint of shale gas on shorter time scales, dominating it on a 20-year time horizon. The footprint for shale gas is greater than that for conventional gas or oil when viewed on any time horizon, but particularly so over 20 years. Compared to coal, the footprint of shale gas is at least 20% greater and perhaps more than twice as great on the 20-year horizon and is comparable when compared over 100 years.

#### Nuke power key to lower electricity prices

Nestle 12 – has longstanding professional experience in the area of energy policy due to his work with the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) (Uwe, February. “Does the use of nuclear power lead to lower electricity prices? An analysis of the debate in Germany with an international perspective” Energy Policy, Volume 41, Pages 152–160)

The call for an increased use of nuclear power is heard in many countries—even after the nuclear accidents in Fukushima, Japan. Supporters of nuclear power argue that this will reduce electricity prices, compared to using less nuclear energy. Furthermore they claim that lower prices will boost economic activity and thus lead to more jobs. In this line of argument the effect of extended nuclear plant life spans on electricity prices is politically of the utmost importance. Electricity price levels finally are not only a matter of concern for single households but in particular for sectors. For the relatively few companies for which higher prices could lead to competitive disadvantages in international trade it might be decisive. In 2000, the German Federal Government signed a contract with the nuclear industry to phase out nuclear energy by 2022. In the amendment of the nuclear power act in 2001 this timetable to phase out nuclear energy entered into force. Only few years later, the discussion on the future of nuclear energy in Germany restarted. One of the major arguments was that prices would be lower if the phase out of nuclear energy is delayed. Electricity prices depend on a variety of factors, one factor might be the availability of nuclear power in the energy mix of a country. It is difficult to predict how these factors interact. In Germany different approaches for assessing the impact of extended nuclear plant life spans are used. Scientific reports on this issue for the Government, industry, or other interest groups often reverts to complex models that represent the electricity market. On the basis of certain assumptions they try to predict the electricity price for decades ahead. In these models nuclear plant life span is one assumption that can be varied. In contrast to such exact quantitative approaches indicators can be used for either revealing general tendencies or for scrutinising the predictions of complex electricity market models. In 2009 and 2010 a number of studies were undertaken using complex theoretical electricity market models. They all concluded that extended nuclear plant life spans will lead to reduced prices for electricity, an increase in GDP, and more jobs. One of these studies was commissioned by the German Federal Government. In October 2010 its results were used to justify delaying the nuclear phase out in Germany from 2022 – as decided in 2000 and 2001 – to at least 2036.

#### Solves the economy

Perry 12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike. After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas. Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025. MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

.

#### Extinction

Mead 9 — Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2009 (“Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, February 4th, Available Online at http://www.tnr.com/story\_print.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8, Accessed 01-25-2009)

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads—but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.